HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

(Court's order whether the case is or not approved for reporting.)

(Chapter VIII Rule 32 (2)(b)

Description of the case.

W.P. No. 2943/01 M/S

Jorawar Singh

Vs

State of U.P.

Approved for reporting

Not approved for reporting

Date of decision 16.06.06

Initial of Judge

IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

WRIT PETITION NO. 2943 (MS) OF 2001

(Old No. 28386/94)

Jorawar Singh, S/o Sri Rubail Singh, R/o Village Madaiya, Bakshi, Tehsil Bajpur, District Nainital. .....Petitioners.

Versus

1. State of U.P.
2. The II Additional District Judge, Nainital.
3. The prescribed Authority Additional Sub Divisional Magistrate, Kashipur, Nainital.

.....Respondents.

Dated: 16.6.2006

Hon'ble Rajesh Tandon, J.

Heard Sri Afsar Ali Khan, Advocate for the petitioner and Standing Counsel for the respondents no. 1 to 3.

By the present writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for a writ of certiorari quashing the orders dated 12.07.1993 passed by the respondent no. 3 and also the order dated 22.03.1994 passed by the respondent no. 2 (Annexure – 3 & 5 to the writ petition respectively).

Appeal was filed against the order dated 12.07.1993 passed by the Prescribed Authority, Kashipur, District-Nainital (Now Udham Singh Nagar) under Section 5 of Uttar Pradesh Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1972 in Eviction Case No.22/ 31 1981-82 *State versus Jorawar Singh*, contained in Annexure No.3 to the writ petition. Notice was issued to the petitioner under Section 4 (1) of the Act, requiring him to show cause as to why he be not evicted from

the Khasra No. 1/8 measuring 6 Bighas situate in Village Kharaly Baksar, Tehsil Bajpur, District Nainital.

Prescribed Authority has passed the order of eviction. Petitioner has preferred the appeal which was rejected as time barred and accordingly the same was dismissed. Petitioner has prepared the present writ petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment dated 16.09.2005 passed in ***Writ Petition No. 1052 (M/S) of 2001 Shri Upkar Singh Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others*** and contended that the proceeding relating to disputed land could not have been initiated under the Uttar Pradesh (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act. If the petitioner was unauthorised occupant on any portion of land belonging to State, the proceeding under Section 122-B of U.P. Zamindari Abolition And Land Reforms Act, 1950 could be drawn against him, as the land held by a tenure holder for the time being is not a public premises.

The definition of **'land'** as defined under Sec.3 (14) of the U.P. Zamindari Abolition And Land Reforms Act, 1950 reads as under:-

> **"Land"** means land held or occupied for purposes connected with agriculture, horticulture or animal husbandry which includes pisciculture and poultry farming.
>
> Section 2(b) defines the public premises as under:-
>
> "2(b) **'Premises'** means any land (including any forest land or trees standing thereon, or covered by water, or a road maintained by the State Government or land appurtenant to such road) or any building or part of a building and includes-

(i) the garden, grounds and outhouses, if any, appurtaining to such building or part of a building, and

(ii) any fittings or fixtures affixed to or any furniture supplied with such building or part of a building for the more beneficial enjoyment thereof,

but dies not include land which for the time being is held by a tenure-holder under any law relating to land tenures;"

"2(e) **'public premises'** means any premises belonging to or taken on lease or requisitioned by or on behalf of the State Government, and includes any premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of-

(i) any company as defined in Section 3 of the Companies Act, 1956, in which not less than fifty-one per cent of the paid up share capital is held by the State Government; or

(ii) any local authority; or

(iii) any Corporation (not being a company as defined in Section 3 of the Companies Act, 1956 or a local authority) owned or controlled by the State Government; or

(iv) Any society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, the governing body whereof consists, under the rules or regulations of the society, wholly or public officers, or nominees of the State Government, or both;

and also includes-

(i) Nazul land or any other premises entrusted to the management of a local authority (including any building built with Government funds on land

belonging to the State Government after the entrustment of the land to that local authority, not being land vested in or entrusted to the management of a Gaon Sabha or any other local authority under any law relating to land tenures);

(ii) any premises acquired under the land Acquisition Act, 1894 with the consent of the State Government for a company (as defined in that Act) and held by that company under an agreement executed under Section 41 of that Act providing for re-entry by State Government in certain conditions;"

Therefore, a conjoin reading of the definitions given under the Uttar Pradesh Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1972 of the '**premises'** and **'public premises'** clearly exclude the application of the provisions of the U.P. Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act in case a tenure holder holds the land for the time being.

A writ of certiorari is issued quashing the order dated 22.03.1994 passed by the respondent no.2.

In view of the above, the matter is sent back to the Prescribed Authority for deciding the case in accordance with law.

Writ petition is allowed. No order as to costs.

(RAJESH TANDON, J.)

16.06.2006
Rathour